DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 586 SP 027 937

AUTHOR Stier, William F., Jr.
TITLE Physical Education Workload Policies, Practices and Procedures on the Junior/Community College Level--A National Inquiry.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the National Convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (Cincinnati, OH, April 10-13, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Athletic Coaches; *Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Workload; National Surveys; *Physical Education Teachers; Tenure; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Results of a national survey of two-year colleges on the subject of workload policies, practices, and procedures within departments of physical education are presented. Responses from a 26 item questionnaire were received from 165 department chairpersons, which constituted a response rate of 55 percent. Included among the topics covered by the questionnaire were questions on: (1) the existence of a workload policy (written or printed) at the institution; (2) amount of faculty input in creating workload policies; (3) faculty status and tenure opportunities for physical education teachers and coaches; (4) teaching workload of coaches; (5) extra compensation for increased workload; (6) hiring practices for staff members who have dual roles as coaches and physical educators; (7) major responsibilities of the physical education chairperson; and (8) evaluation techniques used within the physical education department. It is pointed out that there is a need for written workload policies that are established through the collegial approach with full faculty input and are implemented in a consistent fashion both within individual departments and within the institution as a whole. The survey questionnaire is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273586

PHYSICAL EDUCATION WORKLOAD POLICIES, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES ON THE JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEVEL--A NATIONAL INQUIRY

William F. Stier, Jr.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of AAHPERD, April, 1986

SP027 937

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. F. Stier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION WORKLOAD POLICIES, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES ON THE JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEVEL -- A NATIONAL INQUIRY

A national investigation into workload policies, practices and procedures within departments of physical education in this nation's two year colleges, (junior colleges and community colleges) was concluded in 1983. A survey instrument previously utilized in a national workload investigation conducted by this researcher was reviewed and revised.[1] This newly revised, four page, twenty-six item survey instrument was mailed to 300 randomly selected two year institutions of higher learning in the United States, directed to the chairpersons of the Physical Education departments. One hundred sixty-five department chairpersons responded and provided the researcher with useable instruments, a response rate of 55%.

The undergraduate size of the responding institutions ranged from a low of 225 students to a high of 34,875 students (full time). The average full time undergraduate population was 4839.

Forty-one percent of the institutions had less than 2000 full time students while 70.37% of the schools had less than 5000 such students.

The most popular academic calendar among the schools was the traditional semester system with 65.84% of the institutions possessing such a calendar. The quarter system (27.95%) was the next most prevalent system.

An overwhelming number of physical education chairpersons indicated that a current workload policy did indeed exist on their respective campuses (93.42%). However, a lesser percentage indicated that such a policy actually existed in written/printed form (86.67%). An even smaller percentage of the responding chairpersons (75.50%) revealed that the workload policy -- whether written or not -- was being followed and

SP 027 937

implemented in a similar fashion throughout the entire institution -- department by department. Half of the schools surveyed indicated that the faculty within the physical education department had their workload tasks determined and assigned in accordance with the general guidelines of the total institution. Conversely, 50% of the schools determine physical education faculty workload on a significantly different basis than most of the other faculty within their respective institutions.

Faculty input was significantly involved in the process of creating and formulating current institutional workload policies in 79.73% of the institutions surveyed. In the other twenty percent of the schools, administrative decision making and/or union or collective bargaining decisions accounted for the actual workload policy determination with the absence of significant faculty input, according to the opinions of the chairpersons of the physical education departments.

In terms of faculty status, 36.18% of the schools do not allow athletic coaches to obtain faculty status while allowing physical education teachers to do so. Sixty-one percent of the schools allow both coaches and physical educators to earn faculty status; and, 3.27% of the institutions allow neither coaches nor physical educators to obtain status as full fledged faculty members, with all of the rights and obligations thereof.

In the granting of tenure, both physical educators and coaches were allowed to earn tenure in 37.84% of the programs while 48.65% allow only physical educators to earn this special designation. Neither physical educators nor coaches were able to earn tenure in 13.84% of the institutions studied. An earlier national investigation of small four year college and university physical education programs revealed that 64% of such institutions allowed both those involved in coaching as well as those involved in teaching physical education to earn the coveted status known as tenure.[2] The granting of

tenure is more likely to occur on the smaller college or university campus than at those institutions where so-called big time, Division I sports operate.

Physical educators are asked to coach while teaching full-time in 56.67% of the institutuions studied. Over 43% of the physical Education departments have policies which prohibit such a practice. Only 52.67% of the departments provide for extra compensation for assumption of intercollegiate coaching responsibilities. However, 66.89% of the programs do provide reduced workloads for coaching assignments. Finally, 6.5% of the programs provide for both extra compensation and reduced workload assignments for individuals who are asked to coach.

The physical education administrators were asked for their recommendations as to the appropriateness of providing either extra compensation or reduced workload assignments for selected responsibilities. The responses generated revealed that reduced workload assignments were recommended in more than fifty percent of the schools surveyed for the following departmental responsibilities (in rank order): Coaching (87.77%), Administrative duties (82.73%), Intramural Involvement (69.39%), Student-Teaching Supervision (59.23%), Extramural Involvement (54.47%), and Cheerleading Advisor (51.16%). Only two responsibilities received more than fifty percent of the physical education administrators' recommendations for additional compensation. These two areas of responsibilites were Coaching (74.07%) and Administrative Duties (51.45%).

The top ten factors (in rank order) which the chairpersons indicated were currently being taken into consideration in the determination of total workload for the physical education faculty include: (1) Credit hours taught

(87.59%), (2) Coaching (66.21%), (3) Administrative Duties (43.45%), (4) Student Contact Hours (39.31%), (5) Intramural Involvement (35.17%), (6) Number of Class Preparations (20.00%), (7) Advising Students (15.17%) (8) Number of students taught (11.72%), (9) Services to school/community (11.03%), (10) Cheerleader Advising (9.66%).

Only 17.16% of the institutions have individuals on the payroll whose only institutional (full time) responsibility is in athletic coaching. The majority of these institutions are larger institutions possessing so-called "big time" athletic sports.

In hiring practices, those staff members who have dual responsibilities as coaches and physical educators are hired as coaches first in only 9.46% of the programs, as teachers first in 57.43% of the schools and on an equal emphasis as both coaches and as teachers in 33.11% of the institutions investigated.

In an attempt to fill head coaching positions within the institutions, 52% of the departments have hired individuals who are regular faculty members in another academic department other than physical education within the two year school. This has been facilitated as a result of attempts by institutions to secure full time institutional personnel as coaches while failing to have openings within the physical education department.

Only 8.09% of the athletic programs have established policies or guidelines regarding acceptable win/loss athletic records. However, 40.83% of these same institutions indicated that athletic coaches had been fired or released (or contracts not renewed) within the past decade, 36.94% of the programs had seen coaches fired within the previous five years, while 28.57% of the schools had fired a coach or coaches within the immediately preceeding two year period. However, only 39.57% of the institutions had indicated that their institution had "never" fired a coach for failure to WIN in

athletic competition.

The normal teaching load for a full time physical education teacher within the institutions studied was 14.89 semester hours. Overloads were customarily assigned as a matter of policy and practice in 44.37% of the physical education departments investigated in this national study.

The major responsibilities of the physical education department chairperson were broken down into eight general categories. The percentage of time spent by the chairperson (in rank order) in professional activities include: (1) Administrative Duties (38.95%), (2) Teaching (23.83%), (3) Coaching (16.33%), (4) Service to Community/Institution (6.89%), (5) Committee Work (6.44%), (6) Advising (5.21%), (7) Other Duties (1.81%), and (8) Research/Writing/Publishing (.54%).

In terms of actual time spent (on a weekly basis), the chairperson of physical education spends an average of 44.70 hours per week in the following professional activities: (1) Administrative Duties (17.41 hours), 2) Teaching (10.65 hours), (3) Coaching (7.30 hours), (4) Service to Community/Institution (3.08 hours), (5) Committee Work (2.88 hours), (6) Advising (2.33 hours, (7) Other Duties (.81 hours), and Research/Writing/Publishing (.24 hours).

The chairpersons of physical education departments were asked what factors were presently considered to be a part of the physical education faculty members' total workload responsibility (without extra compensation). The top eleven factors (in rank order) included: (1) Advising students (95.20%) (2) Committee Work (92.00%), (3) Service to Community (83.20%), (4) Coaching (40.00%), (5) Intramural Involvement (35.20%), (6) Administration Duties (33.60%), (7) Club Advisor (24.80%), (8) Extramural Involvement (13.60%) (9) Cheerleader Advisor (12.80%), (10) Research (10.40% tie), and

Writing/Publishing (10.40%).

Evaluation techniques utilized within the physical education departments involved four principle methods -- Self-Evaluation, Student-Evaluation, Administrative-Evaluation, and Peer-Evaluation. The various evaluation systems are summarized below with the most prevalent system (29.80%) being a combination of all four evalution techniques -- Administrative, Self, Peer and Student evaluation. This is in agreement with an earlier investigation of faculty evaluation on four year college campuses.[3]

Evaluation techniques utilized within department of physical education for FACULTY EVALUATION.

	# of Depts.	%	TYPES OF EVALUATION TECHNIQUES							
			Self-E	%	Stud.-E	%	Admin.-E	%	Peer-E	%
	45	29.80	Yes	52.33	Yes	38.14	Yes	31.47	Yes	60.81
	26	17.22	Yes	30.23	Yes	22.03	Yes	18.18		
	21	13.91			Yes	17.80	Yes	14.69		
	20	13.91			Yes	16.95	Yes	13.98	Yes	27.04
	17	11.26					Yes	11.59		
	9	5.96	Yes	10.49			Yes	6.29		
	3	1.99					Yes	2.10	Yes	4.05
tie	2	1.32	Yes	2.33			Yes	1.40	Yes	2.70
tie	2	1.32			Yes	1.69			Yes	2.70
tie	2	1.32			Yes	1.69				
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16						
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16	Yes	.85				
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16					Yes	1.35
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16	Yes	.85			Yes	1.35
	151	100.00%	86	100%	118	100%	143	100%	74	100%
				(56.95%)		(78.15%)		(94.70%)		(49.01%)

It is interesting to note that Administrative-Evaluation is utilized in 94.70% of the institutions surveyed followed by Student-Evaluation (78.15%). Self-Evaluation and Peer-Evaluation (56.95% and 49.01% respectively) occupied third and fourth place within the physical education department in terms of evaluation techniques.

The implementation of a national investigation on the subject of faculty workload in phsyical education departments is certainly timely in light of the

current concern within the profession with accountability. Accountability in the establishment and implementation of workload policies and practices has much impact upon the physical education departments as well as significant impact and effect upon the realization of the departmental and individual professional goals and objectives.

This national research study brings to light the status of current workload practices, policies and procedures in this nation's two year schools. The investigation also brings to light the need for written workload policies -- created/established through the collegial approach with full faculty input -- which are implemented in a consistent fashion both within individual departments and within the institution as a whole.

It is essential that the needs of an institutuion, individual departments and most importantly -- individual students and faculty members -- be considered in the establishment and implementation of faculty/staff workload policies. Such policies are, or can be, individualistic in nature on a department by department basis. Consistency in the establishment and implementation of workload policies does not mean that there cannot be taken into consideration individual needs which are evident within the departments themselves or the individual needs of the faculty members.

There are general principles which may be ascertained via a review of the findings of an investigation such as this study, principles which can be utilized as building blocks for the devlopment and refinement of departmental or institutional workload policies/practices/procedures.

[1]Stier, Jr., William F. An Investigation and Evaluation of Faculty Workloads Research in Education. ERIC ED 049 681. August 1971. p. 42

[2]Stier, Jr., William F. Professional Preparation Programs in Selected Colleges And Universities in the United States. AAHPERD Midwest Convention - Research Consortium. March 11, 1983. Dayton, Ohio

[3]Stier, Jr., William F. Physical Education Faculty and Programs in Small Colleges. The Physical Educator. December 1982. p. 195.

RESEARCHER: Dr. William F. Stier, Jr.
Chairperson/Professor: Physical Education and Sport
Athletic Director
State University of New York
Brockport, New York 14420

WORKLOAD POLICIES, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

JUNIOR COLLEGES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1. Type of academic calendar:

Institutions	%	Calendar
106	65.84	Semester
45	27.95	Quarter
4	2.49	Trimester
3	1.86	Three Terms
1	.62	4-1-4
1	.62	4-4-1
1	.62	Other
161	100.00%	

Four institutions failed to respond to this item

2. Availability of current POLICY pertaining to faculty workload:

Institutions	%	Availability
142	93.42	Available
10	6.58	NOT Available
152	100.00%	

3. Is the available faculty workload policy in written form?

Institutions	%	Written Form
130	86.67	Yes
20	13.33	No
150	100.00	

4. Is the faculty workload policy followed in a similar fashion throughout the institution -- department by department?

Institutions	%	Consistent Within Institution
114	75.50	Consistent
37	24.50	Not Consistent
151	100.00%	

5. Are workloads of faculty in physical education determined in accordance with the general guidelines of the institutional faculty or are physical education faculty assigned workloads and responsibilities on a different basis from that of other faculty within the institution?

Institutions	%	Consistent/Not Consistent
74	50.00	Consistent
74	50.00	Not Consistent
158	100.00%	

6. Are physical educators and coaches assigned faculty status?

Institutions	%	Faculty Status
92	60.53	Both Physical Educators & Coaches can earn such status
55	36.18	Only Physical Educators can earn such status
5	3.29	Neither can earn faculty status
0	-0-	Only Coaches can earn such status
152	100.00%	

7. Are physical educators and coaches able to earn tenure status?

Institutions	%	Tenure Status Obtainable
72	48.65	Only Physical Educators
56	37.84	Both Can Earn Tenure
20	13.51	Neither Can Earn Tenure
0	-0-	Only Coaches
148	100.00%	

8. Are departmental members paid extra for assuming coaching responsibilities?

Institutions	%	Extra Compensation
79	52.67	Yes
71	47.33	No
150	100.00%	

9. Are departmental members asked to coach while teaching full-time in the institution?

Institutions	%	Yes/No
85	56.67	Yes
65	43.33	No
150	100.00%	

10. Are departmental members who assume coaching duties given a reduced workload in other areas of their responsibilities?

Institutions	%	Reduced Workload
99	66.89	Yes
49	33.11	No
148	100.00%	

11. Factors which enter in a significant manner in a determination of total workload for the physical education faculty.

Institutions	RANK	%	Factors
127	1	87.59	Credit hours taught
96	2	66.21	Coaching
63	3	43.45	Administrative duties
57	4	39.31	Student contact hours
51	5	35.17	Intramural Involvement
29	6	20.00	Number of class preparations
22	7	15.17	Advising students
17	8	11.72	Number of students taught
16	9	11.03	Services to school/community
14	10	9.66	Cheerleader advisor
9	11	6.21	Committee work
8	12	5.52	Degree held
7 tie	13	4.83	Teaching experience
7 tie	13	4.83	Extramural involvement
6	15	4.14	Club advisor
5 tie	16	3.45	Student-teaching supervision
5 tie	16	3.45	Other

Twenty-five institutions failed to respond to this item

12. Are there any coaches in the institution who are considered full-time staff but who have no other responsibility than those directly connected with coaching a sport or sports (coaching and/or administrative responsibilities for the individual's sport(s))?

Institutions	%	Only Athletic Responsibilities
23	17.16	Yes, only athletic duties
111	82.84	Other duties, additionally
134	100.00%	

13. Are individuals who coach and teach within the department hired as coaches first or as teachers first?

Institutions	%	Teachers/Coaches First
14	9.46	As Coaches First
85	57.43	As Teachers First
49	33.11	Hired With Equal Emphasis
148	100.00%	

14. Are there individuals who have head coaching responsibility who do not teach within the department but within another institutional department?

Institutions	%	Within Another Department
78	52.00	Yes
72	48.00	No
150	100.00%	

15. Has the department/institution established (written or otherwise) minimum level of competency for coaching in terms of winning/losing?

Institutions	%	Minimum Competency Levels
11	8.09	Yes
125	91.91	No
136	100.00%	

16. Has the institution ever NOT retained (i.e., released, fired, not renewed) an individual who coached?

Institutions		
Yes	No	
49	71	. . . . . within the past ten years
41	69	. . . . . within the past five years
32	80	. . . . . within the past two years

17. Number of institutions which have never "fired" a coach for a losing record.

Number of institutions: Fifty-Five (39.57% of population responding to item)

18. The normal teaching load for a full time teacher within the department.

Normal teaching load is: 14.89 semester hours

19. Are department members assigned overloads?

Institutions	%	Overloads
63	44.37	Assigned
79	55.63	Not Assigned
177	100.00%	

20. Approximate percentage of the department chairperson's time spent in various professional activities/endeavors on a weekly basis.

Percentage of Time Spent	RANK	Professional Activities
38.95	1	Administrative Duties
23.83	2	Teaching
16.33	3	Coaching
6.89	4	Service to Community/Institution
6.44	5	Committee Work
5.21	6	Advising
1.81	7	Other
.54	8	Research/Writing/Publishing

Thirty-seven institutions failed to respond to this item

21. Approximate amount of time -- in clock hours -- spend as department chairperson in the following endeavors, on a weekly basis.

Time Spent (hours)	RANK	Professional Activities
17.41 hours	1	Administrative Duties
10.65 hours	2	Teaching
7.30 hours	3	Coaching
3.08 hours	4	Service to Community/Institution
2.88 hours	5	Committee Work
2.33 hours	6	Advising
.81 hours	7	Other
.24 hours	8	Research/Writing/Publishing
44.70 Total Hours		

Thirty-seven institutions failed to respond to this item

22. Factors which are considered to be a part of an individual physical education faculty member's total responsibility within the institution and assumed in addition (but without additional compensation) to the so-called regular teaching assignments usually undertaken by teaching personnel.

Institutions	%	RANK	Factors Considered
119	95.20	1	Advising Students
115	92.00	2	Committee Work
104	83.20	3	Service to Community
50	40.00	4	Coaching
44	35.20	5	Intramural Involvement
42	33.60	6	Administrative Duties
31	24.80	7	Club Adviser
17	13.60	8	Extramural Involvement
16	12.80	9	Cheerleader Advisor
13 tie	10.40	10	Research
13 tie	10.40	11	Writing/Publishing
9	7.20	12	Student-Teaching Supervision

Forty institutions failed to respond to this item

23. Should physical education faculty members receive extra compensation for assuming any of the following responsibilities?

Total Institutions	Additional Compensation Yes	%	No	%	Selected Responsibilities
123	7	5.69	111	90.24	Services to Community
99	22	22.22	77	77.77	Research
99	16	16.16	83	83.83	Writing/Publishing
135	100	74.07	35	25.93	Coaching
123	26	26.14	97	28.86	Advising Students
133	57	42.86	76	57.14	Intramural Involvement
119	42	35.29	77	69.71	Extramural Involvement
126	62	49.21	64	50.80	Cheerleading Advisor
121	34	28.10	87	71.90	Club Advisor
121	7	5.79	114	94.21	Committee Involvement
119	34	28.57	85	71.43	Student-Teaching Supervision
138	71	51.45	57	41.30	Administrative Duties

24. Should physical education faculty members receive reduced workload assignments for assuming any of the following responsibilities?

Total Institutions	Reduced Workload Yes	%	No	%	Selected Responsibilities
137	29	21.17	108	78.83	Services to Community
124	54	43.55	70	56.45	Research
128	36	28.12	92	71.88	Writing/Publishing
139	122	87.77	17	12.23	Coaching
137	50	36.50	87	68.50	Advising Students
147	102	69.39	45	30.61	Intramural Involvement
123	67	54.47	56	45.53	Extramural Involvement
129	66	51.16	63	48.84	Cheerleading Advisor
130	40	30.77	90	69.23	Club Advisor
139	30	21.58	109	78.42	Committee Involvement
130	77	59.23	53	40.77	Student-Teaching Supervision
139	115	82.73	24	17.27	Administrative Duties

25. Were present workload policies/practices developed through faculty input?

Institutions	%	Faculty Input
118	79.73	Yes
30	20.27	No
148	100.00%	

26. Evaluation techniques utilized within department of physical education for FACULTY EVALUATION:

	# of Depts.		TYPES OF EVALUATION TECHNIQUES							
		%	Self-E	%	Stu.-E	%	Admin.-E	%	Peer-E	%
	45	29.80	Yes	52.33	Yes	38.14	Yes	31.47	Yes	60.81
	26	17.22	Yes	30.23	Yes	22.03	Yes	18.18		
	21	13.91			Yes	17.80	Yes	14.69		
	20	13.24			Yes	16.95	Yes	13.98	Yes	27.04
	17	11.26					Yes	11.59		
	9	5.96	Yes	10.49			Yes	6.29		
	3	1.99					Yes	2.10	Yes	4.05
tie	2	1.32	Yes	2.33			Yes	1.40	Yes	2.70
tie	2	1.32			Yes	1.69			Yes	2.70
tie	2	1.32			Yes	1.69				
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16						
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16	Yes	.85				
tie	1	.66	Yes	1.16					Yes	1.35
tie	1	.66	Yes		Yes	.85			Yes	1.35
	151	100.00%	86	100%	118	100%	143	100%	74	100%
				(56.95%)		(78.15%)		(94.70%)		(49.01%)

27. Size of responding institutions.

Institutions	Range of Full Time Undergraduate Students
38	225 - 999
17	1000 - 1999
18	2000 - 2999
11	3000 - 3999
11	4000 - 4999
6	5000 - 5999
7	6000 - 6999
2	7000 - 7999
2	8000 - 8999
3	9000 - 9999
10	10,000 - 14,999
3	15,000 - 19,999
3	20,000 - 24,000
3	25,000 - 29,999
1	30,000 - 34,999
135	

28. Average size of undergraduate enrollment. (range: 225 low; 34,875 high)

Average size of the undergraduate enrollment was: 4839 STUDENTS

Research completed by: Dr. William F. Stier, Jr.
Chairperson/Professor: Physical Education & Sport
Athletic Director
State University of New York
Brockport, New York 14420